



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

run the risk of heresy, by opposing a prevalent doctrine in his Church.

At any rate, what we are concerned with is not the private opinion of one of our correspondents, but the prevalent doctrine in the Roman Catholic Church, and it still remains true that while that Church makes men's salvation absolutely dependent on the validity of the sacraments which they receive, her doctrine of intention makes it *absolutely impossible* for any individual to know whether he has ever received a true sacrament or not. As for the retort, that there is equal uncertainty as to the sacraments of the Church of England, we have fully answered it in our April number.

Our correspondent reminds us, in conclusion, that our time is only wasted in discussing individual dogmas. And it is very true that if the infallibility of the Church could be once demonstrated, there would be an end of all further discussion. We have "implicit faith in the Redeemer, as having made a perpetual provision for the poor and ignorant, as well as the learned, in a visible institution, and by miraculous agency;" but when it is asserted that the teaching of this visible institution must always be free from any mixture of error, we believe this to be a rash and precarious inference. And our correspondent acknowledges that it is not a matter of demonstrative certainty. Any question, then, which is proved by probable evidence (as distinct from demonstrative) must be decided by balancing opposite probabilities. And it is quite to the purpose, besides discussing, as we have never shrunk from doing, the direct proofs of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, to examine whether her decisions on individual dogmas are in accordance with reason, with Scripture, and with history.]

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I have carefully read your answer to my letter on the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; but before I notice your objections, you will give me leave to say a few words, to which I earnestly invite the attention of your readers. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have no sympathy with those, if there be any such persons, who believe that discussion would, in any way, prove injurious to the Roman Catholic religion. On the contrary, I firmly believe that it would be of incalculable service to it; because almost all the knowledge which Protestants have of Catholic principles is derived from Protestant books. I have some of those books myself, and, pray what do they all say? Why, they say, beware of Popish books, Popish priests, and Popish superstition—Papists are idolaters, dust-worshippers, &c., &c. Thus, not one Protestant out of a million ever had an opportunity of knowing the genuine Catholic principles. They will not, or do not, read our works to see our real doctrines; but apply to polluted sources for information. As the county Wexford man said, "The little knowledge which Protestants possess of our religion is borrowed entirely from the declamations of pulpit violence, and misrepresentation of interested prejudice." In general, Catholic principles are exhibited in all the dark colourings of malevolence, and in all the ludicrous shapes of low ribaldry. In the words of the poet—

"A hideous figure of their foes they draw;
Nor lines, nor looks, nor shades, nor colours true,
And this grotesque design expose to public view—
And yet the daubing pleases."

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN, then, if it be honestly and fairly conducted, will remedy this state of things, as it will bring our genuine doctrines home to those who never knew them before—doctrines, sir, which would not be found wanting if tested by the touchstone of eternal truth; because each and every one of them bears unmistakably the impress of heaven. Let no calumny find its way into the columns of your journal; insert the letters of your Catholic correspondents; in your imaginary dialogues put strong arguments at the side of the Catholic interlocutor (hitherto you have not done this last, though you are able), and I, for one, have no fear for the result. On the contrary, if you do these things I believe that the CATHOLIC LAYMAN will prove the best periodical, for the reasons above stated, that ever appeared in this country in the cause of Catholicism; because, through its medium, thousands, I am persuaded, who are now wandering in the valley of the shadow of death, will be converted. I cannot conclude these remarks without tendering you my best thanks for the space you have, from time to time, given me in your journal, and without saying that I admire your fairness, as far, at least, as my letters are concerned, you have published them in full, not a mot, for which I am grateful. Craving pardon for here occupying so much of your valuable space, I now turn to the immediate subject under consideration.

In the first place, you bring forward Judas; but I cannot conceive for what reason, or how the case of that prince of apostates affords any solid argument against the Real Presence; as it is admitted by all that he received the holy Eucharist unworthily; and St. Paul tells us that "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." 1 Cor., xi. 29. Surely, we cannot be required to discern the body of Christ where it is not. Judas, then, actually

received the body and blood of the Lord; but it by no means follows that he was to have everlasting life by so doing, because it is only to the worthy receiver that the promises in the 6th chapter of St. John are made. Therefore, the everlasting death of Judas cannot be considered as excluding the Real Presence of Christ from the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Next, you tell me that our Lord used forms of expressions "precisely similar" to that of "This is my body," without transubstantiation. Now, if you could substantiate that assertion—if you could clearly and unequivocally prove that the phrases—The rock was Christ; I am the door; this chalice is the New Testament in my blood, &c., &c., were precisely similar in their nature, as you assert, to the words of the institution of the Eucharist, the dispute were at an end; but I fearlessly defy you to do so. You are caught there without any hopes of escaping; for any man of common sense, any grammatical tyro, can see that they not only are not precisely similar, but that they are altogether different. So that it is exceedingly ridiculous to compare or liken them. If the forms of expression were thus—I am "a" door; "I am" "a" vine; this chalice is "a" Testament, &c., &c.—employing the indefinite, instead of the definite article—I own you would have some reason for saying they were similar; and that if one thing were transubstantiated the others would be also. The, definite article, however, being employed in all those expressions, clearly and unmistakably shows that they are figurative, and bear no manner of resemblance to "This is my body," which is a plain form, containing no figure of speech. For instance, Christ is not "a" door, but "the" door; that is to say, all must enter heaven through or by Him. There is not, Mr. Editor, a figurative form of expression from beginning to end of the sacred volume like that of "This is my body," "This is my blood."

You refer next to St. Augustine, and endeavour to drag him over to your side—to your real but figurative presence; but how could he teach the Protestant doctrine on this point, when I find the following in the genuine works of that great luminary of the Church, viz.:—"How David could be carried in his own hands we find not, but in Christ we do, for he was carried in his own hands; when, giving his body, He said, 'This is my body,' for then he carried that body in his own hands."—Ser. 33, Ps. And again—"Christ commending the Sacrament of the faithful to us, said—'Except you eat, &c., you cannot have life in you.' So the life saith of life: and to him that thinketh the life to be a liar, this meat shall be death and not life to him."—Ser. 2. de Ver. A., & 1.

As this letter is intended for the June number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, I must necessarily conclude.

Your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Passage, 1st June, 1856.

[If our readers will take the trouble of referring to the former letter of our respected correspondent, they will see that he adduced our Lord's words in John vi., 52, 56—"The bread that I will give is my flesh, &c.;" "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed," in proof that there was a real, corporeal presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. We replied, that if the flesh and blood here spoken of meant our Lord's actual literal flesh and blood, received in the Lord's Supper, then Judas ought to have been saved; for our Lord had said—"If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." Mr. Rourke now replies, that "it is only to the worthy receiver that the promises in the 6th chapter of St. John are made." This statement, though true, does not save his argument. We beg to remind our correspondent that he is arguing for the strict, literal, verbal truth of the passages which he quoted. We availed ourselves of the common logical argument, *ex absurdo*, to prove to him that if this principle of interpretation were adopted, it would lead to a plain contradiction. Mr. Rourke now tries to avoid the difficulty by assuming that, besides the actual literal eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood, the receiver must be worthy, i.e.—must have faith. In other words, Mr. Rourke gives up the literal principle of interpretation, and unconsciously adopts the doctrine of the Church of England, that "the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper (i.e., that body of Christ, the eating of which, according to His own promise, confers spiritual life) is faith." In this conclusion, we, of course, agree with him; but we need scarcely remind him, that this is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which holds that the body of Christ is received alike by those who have not faith and those who have.

Our correspondent expresses such admiration of St. Augustine, whom he justly styles "that great luminary of the Church," that we are tempted to quote his interpretation of our Lord's words in John vi., which will perhaps prove more convincing to Mr. Rourke than any exposition of ours. The Jews, it will be remembered, strove among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (John vi. 52.) St. Augustine comments on our Lord's reply to this objection, as follows:—

"Christ instructed them, and said unto them; 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words which I speak unto you are spirit and life.' As if he had said: 'Understand spiritually what I have

spoken. You are not about to eat this identical body which you see; and you are not about to drink this identical blood, which they who crucify me will pour out. I have commended unto you a certain sacrament, which, if spiritually understood, will vivify you; though it must be celebrated visibly, it must be understood invisibly.'^a No one who reads these words can imagine for a moment that St. Augustine held the doctrine of transubstantiation.

We have but little space to reply to Mr. Rourke's remaining objections. He says, "If you could clearly and unequivocally prove that the phrases, the rock was Christ; I am the door; this chalice is the New Testament in my blood, were precisely similar in their nature to the words of the institution of the Eucharist, the dispute were at an end." Surely, Mr. Rourke must see that this admission is fatal to his argument. He can hardly deny that the last of the three passages just cited, "This chalice is the New Testament in my blood," is "*precisely similar* to the words of the institution of the Eucharist," for this plain reason, that they are the *very words of institution itself*. The Eucharist, we need scarcely remind our readers, was instituted under a double form—that of bread and wine. The words of institution of the former were, "This is my body;" and of the latter, "This chalice is the New Testament in my blood." We argued that a similar principle of interpretation must be applied to these two phrases; and, that as nobody can believe that a chalice, or cup, can be *literally* and *physically* a testament, so, in like manner, we cannot be called on to believe that the bread can be literally and physically Christ's body. Our argument turned on the meaning to be assigned to the verb "is" (*est*); and the distinction which Mr. Rourke endeavours to set up between the definite and indefinite article is plainly beside the question. There is no difference, that we can see, between the phrases, "This chalice is a Testament," and, "This chalice is *the* New Testament," except this, that in the former, the chalice, or cup, is said to represent a testament in general, and in the latter it is said to represent or symbolize the particular testament which was then instituted. In both cases alike, it is evident to common sense, that an *actual physical* identity of the two things compared is out of the question; and, if so, the same principle is applicable to the words, "This is my body."

With regard to Mr. Rourke's quotations from St. Augustine, we might safely leave them to be refuted by the passage which we have cited above; but for the satisfaction of our respected correspondent, who has evidently a great respect for the opinion of that eminent Father, we will add one extract more. St. Augustine, in his treatise against Adimantus, writes as follows: "The Lord did not hesitate to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body." (Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.—St. Aug., Tom. viii., col. 124.) It was, therefore, "*the sign*" of his body that our Lord carried in his own hands, according to St. Augustine—a conclusion, we beg to add, in entire accordance with reason and common sense, and to which we hope Mr. Rourke will subscribe.

We beg to thank our respected correspondent for the flattering terms in which he has noticed our labours, in the earlier part of his letter. The fact that our columns are freely thrown open to all Roman Catholic correspondents is the best proof which we can offer, that we do not wish to keep back from the knowledge of our readers the strongest arguments that can be brought forward on the side of the Church of Rome. We can assure Mr. Rourke that since the commencement of our journal, our object has been to adopt the honest, consistent, impartial course which he describes. We gladly accept his acknowledgment, that we have dealt fairly with all the communications with which he has favoured us, and our earnest desire is, that (in the words of our correspondent) our labours may tend to promote the cause of true Catholicism in Ireland.]

WAS ST. PETER AGAINST BIBLE READING?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR, there is no use in talking, but the Bibles are spreading in spite of the priests; and the queerest thing of all is, the more the boys are warned against them, the more eager they're for them. Myself often thinks they're like the pigs down in our parts; you must pull them east if you want them to go west. But, anyhow, we had a great sermon last Sunday from Father John on the head of it. "Boys," says he, "I hear that some of ye are setting yourselves up for reading the Bible, and that ye think yourselves able to understand it; but," says he, "I'll soon take the conceit out of ye, and I'll show ye that 'twould take wiser men than ye to understand that book. I'll leave it to the book itself," says he; "and 'twill tell you that the likes of you couldn't by any means comprehend it." So, with that he opened the Douay Bible, "and," says he, "St. Peter says that the Bible contains 'certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.'^a Now,

^a Spiritu aliter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus, quod videtis, manducaturi estis; et bibitur illud sanguinem quem fuditur qui me crucifigunt. S. Aug. opera. Ed. Ben. tom. iv., Col. 1066.

boys," says he, "I'll leave it to yourselves aren't most of you unlearned men, and isn't it clear from this, that if you go reading the Bible you'll wrest it to your own destruction? St. Peter warns you against it, and the book itself warns you against it; and," says he, "take my advice, and leave it to your clergy, that's learned and knowledgeable about such matters, and don't destroy your souls by reading a book that you can't understand." Well, sir, this troubled me greatly; and when I went home after mass I looked in the Douay, and sure enough, there were the words, and I couldn't tell what to make of them; but after a while some of the boys came in, and says Andy, "I hope you're satisfied now that the Bible isn't fit for the likes of you. And," says he, "take care that you don't destroy your own soul with it; and," says he, "isn't it a mighty great notion you have of yourself to think you could understand it? And," says he, "you're very fond of raking up what St. Peter says against our Church; but I think St. Peter has done for you now—he has stopped your jaw for once." "Troth," says Mick, "that's true anyhow; and myself doesn't know what to make of St. Peter. When I heard of his being in favour of discussion, and ordering every man to give a reason for the hope that is in him,^b I set him down for a Protestant; but now it looks as if he was a true Roman; for he's as much against the Bible as Father John himself." Well, sir, I was quite bothered, and hadn't a word in my mouth; but by great good luck the Reader came in and took up the argument; and, says he, "boys, it's no use arguing without referring to the book itself," and with that he pulled out a Douay Bible, and made any of the boys that had them do the same. And after he read out the verses, he showed us that St. Peter was speaking of St. Paul's Epistles, and saying that St. Paul had spoken of the same things about which he had been speaking a little before—namely, the destruction of the world and the coming of Christ; and that in these subjects there were some things hard to be understood, which unlearned people twisted and turned to their own destruction. "Them's the very words of Father John," says Andy; "and that's the reason he won't let the boys have Bibles." "Well," says the Reader, "whatever Father John may think, that's not what St. Peter thought; for he didn't tell the people not to read the Bible; he only told them to take warning by the examples of those who made a bad use of the Scriptures." "But," says Jerry, "didn't he order them to have no call at all to the Bible?" "No," says the Reader, "he didn't do any such thing." "Well," says he, "Father John told us plainly that St. Peter ordered them to give up Bible reading altogether." "Well," says the Reader, "you can see for yourself that he did no such thing; but he told them to take heed to themselves not to fall into the error of those who wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction." "But," says Andy, "isn't it all the same? Sure, when he warned the people against destroying themselves by means of the Bible 'twas all one as if he told them to have no call to it." "I don't think it's the same thing at all," says the Reader; "for," says he, "if I warned you not to cut yourself with that knife, 'twould be a very different thing from telling you never to handle a knife again, and, in like manner, if I warned you against making a bad use of a book, 'twould be very different from telling you to have nothing to say to the book at all; and," says he, "if St. Peter wished to keep the people from the Bible, he would have said so; but, instead of that, he only warns them against misusing it." "I suppose," says Mick, "he meant that we're to use the Bible, but not abuse it, by twisting and turning its meaning." "Just so," says the Reader; "for if we use it properly it's a blessing, but if we twist it about to suit ourselves we're wresting it to our own destruction." "But, after all," says Andy, "isn't it easier to do as our priests do? to keep it from the people entirely, and then there's no fear of their twisting or turning it at all." "It's easier, no doubt," says the Reader; "but I'm thinking in that case the remedy would be worse than the disease." "How so?" says Andy. "Because," says he, "the soul would be starved entirely without the word of God. The Bible is meat and drink to it," says he; "and if you take it away, the soul will starve for want of it." "Troth," says Mick, "that reminds me of Con Kelly's horse." "How so?" says the Reader. "Why," says Mick, "the horse got at the oat-bin one day, and eat until he got a surfeit; so Con asked his landlord (a fine English gentleman) what ought he to do; and, says he, 'my man, my advice is, never give your horse another grain of oats, and then there will be no fear of a surfeit.' 'True for your honour,' says Con; 'there would be no fear of a surfeit, but there would be some fear of his dying altogether on me; and to tell you the truth, I think the remedy is worse than the disease; and when the priests take away the Bible that God gave as food for our souls, like He gave oats as food for horses, I can't help thinking of Con Kelly and his landlord.' 'That's the very way, then,' says the Reader; "and you all see how foolish 'twould be to keep oats from a horse for ever, because he had once eat too much; but wouldn't it be still more absurd to keep oats from every horse in the parish, because one or two horses had injured themselves with it?" "Faix," says Jerry, "that would be too foolish entirely.

^b 1 Peter, iii. 15.

"'Twould be bad enough to keep it from the one that had made a bad use of it, but 'twould be too bad to keep it from the others, that hadn't misused it at all." "Well," says the Reader, "just see how the priests act. They aren't content with keeping the Bible from those who wrest it to their own destruction, but they do their best to keep it from every one." "Troth," says Mick, "I see now that we're sold entirely; for," says he, "if one man in the parish makes a bad use of his Bible, that's no reason why we should all be hindered from reading it. And," says he, "Father John might just as well stop the oats from all the horses in the parish, on account of Con Kelly's horse eating too much." "And moreover," says the Reader, "who are the people that St. Peter says wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction?" "The unlearned and unstable," says Andy. "Well," says the Reader, "whose fault is it that you're unlearned in the word of God? Isn't it the fault of your priests, who don't instruct you in it? And," says he, "the way to hinder you from being unlearned in the Scriptures would be to grind it into you ever and always; and," says he, "if the priests gave every man a Bible, and had it taught every day in their schools, and preached out of it constantly, and had Sunday schools for teaching it to the childer, then the people wouldn't be unlearned, or wrest it to their own destruction; and," says he, "instead of that verse teaching you to put away the word of God, it should teach you to be twice as diligent in reading it, and that you should study it night and day, and get all the instruction you could about it, and then there would be no fear of your wresting it to your destruction." "Well," says Jerry, "it's a great ease to me to find that St. Peter isn't against the Bible, but only against people being ignorant and unlearned in it; and, sure enough, the way to prevent us from being unlearned in the Scriptures is to give it out to us, and explain it to us; but I'm thinking that keeping the Bible from us isn't a good way to make us learned in it." "But," says Andy, "the word 'unlearned' in the text means them that are unlearned in Latin and Greek, such as the likes of us that never went through college." "Well," says the Reader, "I don't think it could mean that; for if it did, then the Apostles themselves would have wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction; for we're told that some of them were 'illiterate and ignorant men,' and we know that there were poor fishermen among them, that I'm thinking never went through college." "That sets my mind at rest," says Jerry; "for it's plain that it can't be college learning St. Peter means." "Isn't it a queer thing," says Mick, "that the priests never say a word against any book but God's Book? There's many a bad book in the parish, with bad pictures, and bad songs, that put bad thoughts into people's heads, and still the priests never say a word against them; but they're ever and always speaking against the Bible." "True for you," says Jerry, "and it surprises me that they don't hold their tongues entirely about it. If they had sense they wouldn't speak of it at all, good or bad, for they're only burning their fingers with it. They ought to make the child's bargain with it—let me alone, and I'll let you alone." "But you should remember," says the Reader, "that it takes two to make a bargain. The priests would be glad enough to let the Bible alone if it would let them alone; but the Bible won't make that bargain with them—it won't let them alone; so their only chance is to put it down; for if they don't, it will put them down." "How is that?" says Andy. "Why," says the Reader, "a priest can't open his mouth but the Bible is down upon him. When he's coaxing the money out of some poor fellow for sprinkling his boat with holy water, the Bible says:—'Through covetousness, with feigned words, you're making merchandise of him;'^a and when he's screwing the half crowns out of the poor creatures for masses, the Bible says—'Keep thy money to thyself, to perish with thee; because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money;'^c and when he's striking a bargain for redeeming a soul out of purgatory, the Bible says—'You were not redeemed with corruptible things, as gold or silver, but with the precious blood of Christ;'^d and when he repeats the commandments, the Bible says—'Where's the second commandment, you schemer?—where's the commandment about graven images?—why have you left some of me out?—isn't that nice treatment for the word of God?' Then, when he tells you to pray to the saints, to put in a good word for you, the Bible says—'Don't be deceiving the people, for there's but 'one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus;'^e then, when the priest runs away from the Protestant ministers, the Bible says—'Aren't you a purty Christian, that can't give a reason for the hope that is in you?'^f and, says the Bible, 'why are you afraid of the light, if so be that you're holding on to the truth?' then when he's telling you how holy the priests are because they don't marry, the Bible says—'Arra, don't be making fools of the people—wasn't St. Peter a married man?'^g and doesn't St. Paul say—'Let deacons be the husbands of one wife?'^h and when he promises to give you absolution, and to blot out your sins, the Bible says—'Take care what you're at; there's none can do that but God; listen

^a Acts iv. 13.
^b 2 Peter, ii. 3.
^c Acts xiii. 18.
^d 1 Peter, i. 18.
^e Exodus xx. 4, 5.

^f 1 Tim. iii. 5.
^g 1 Peter, iii. 15.
^h John iii. 20, 21.
ⁱ Matt. viii. 14.
^j 1 Tim. iii. 12.

to what He says—'I am He that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake.'^m When the priest warns you against reading the Bible, the Bible itself says, 'Search the Scriptures;'ⁿ when he tells you that you can't understand the Scriptures, the Bible says, 'Didn't Timothy from his infancy know the Holy Scriptures?'^o And when he says, 'that the Scriptures will ruin you,' the Bible says, 'No, but 'twill instruct them into salvation.'^p He can't even curse a jumper, or horsewip a souper, but the Bible is at him.^q So that you see, boys," says the Reader, "the Bible won't make the bargain of let me alone and I'll let you alone, and the priests see plainly that if they don't put it down, it will put them down." "Why, then," says Jerry, "if it comes to that, I know who has the best chance. And," says he, "I'd back the Bible any day against all the priests in Ireland." And to tell your honour the truth, I'm beginning to be something of the same mind myself.

Your humble servant to command,
 DAN CARTHY.

ST. KIELAN'S WELL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—As you are desirous of information as to popular superstitions in this country, I beg to inform you that there is a holy well near Hollymount, in the county Mayo, over which grows a very fine old ash tree. The superstition is, that it came and grew there in one night. The well is dedicated to St. Kiellan, and has a regular station. It is melancholy to see the poor Romanists going their rounds at this place, drinking at the well, and depositing offerings, bits of corduroy, red flannel, wool, calico, horse and cow hair. There is a regular path-way round the well and tree. No Roman Catholic passes this place, which is on the road side, without bowing reverentially towards the tree, and sometimes taking off their hats; even when returning from the chapel, quite drunk, they stop to bow at the tree. Neither priests nor monks ever raise their voice against this gross idolatry.

Faithfully yours,
 A CONSTANT READER.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

Weeds are now growing apace, and require the constant use of the hoe to keep them down.

Carrots, Parsnips, Suedes, and Mangels, which have been sown in time, will require hoeing and singling out before the end of the month. Keep them clean; for, if the weeds are suffered now to get a head of the crop, the trouble and expense to keep them down will be much increased, and no after management will recover them from the injury sustained. Where the necessary breadth of Suedes and mangels has not been got in, every exertion must be made to do so, or other green crops substituted. Dale's hybrid and the Aberdeen turnips should be sown before the end of the month to ensure good crops.

Beans and Peas, when sown in drills, should be hoed between and earthed up; if sown broadcast, they must be hand-hoed and weeded for the last time.

Clover and Grass seeds, where not sown immediately after the corn, should now be sown without delay, as the grain crops will be shooting into the culm or seed stem, when it would be injurious to either harrow or roll them.

Winter Vetches sown with oats or rye will now be in process of consumption, and the land prepared for and sown with such varieties of the turnip tribe as will be most applicable to the date of sowing.

Potatoes should be carefully attended to; those planted in lazy beds should be carefully hand wed, and a little fresh earth put amongst them, and such as are but coming up should have some fresh earth dug from the furrows and strewed over them. Those planted in drills should be hand and horse-hoed between, and earthed up lightly with the double mould board plough.

Rape and Hundred-headed Cabbage should now be sown where it is required to have strong plants to put out in the stubble lands after harvest: sow thinly in clean, rich, well tilled land, in beds four feet wide with 18 inch alleys between; keep them clean, and when well up, thin out to 5 or 6 inches every way; they will be strong, hardy plants for putting out when required.

Clover and Ray-grass will now be coming in to succeed the vetches for soiling; let it lie exposed to the sun and air for 5 or 6 hours after being cut, before using it; this prevents hove.

Pigs may now be put on green vetches and clover, given in their yards, or they may with great benefit and profit be turned out in clover paddock, and kept there day and night, on which they thrive rapidly.

Odds and ends.—See that the manure, as it is being turned out for the green crops, is not left exposed to the sun, wind, or rain, to dissipate its fertilizing components, but that it be deposited at once in the drills, and covered up with the drill plough; cut and stack turf for fuel, empty ponds, ditches, water courses, and cart it to the compost ground, there to be mixed when dry enough with lime, or other rich fertilizing materials.—*Farmers' Gazette.*

^m Isaiah xlii. 25.
ⁿ John v. 39.

^o 2 Tim. iii. 15.
^p 2 Tim. iii. 15.
^q 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.